THE MIZAN NEWSLETTER
Vol.2 No.4 April 1960

The Mizan Newsletter aims at giving an objective and balanced account of current Soviet writings on the Middle East

---

The first article in this issue, the second of three articles on Soviet Views on Turkey, examines Soviet views on the country's internal situation. The Soviet view of etatism, as practised under Ataturk and under his successors, is examined; and it is shown that Soviet writers approve of etatism as an economic doctrine, but consider that it has been virtually abandoned in Turkey today to the advantage of Turkish and foreign "monopolist capital". Secondly, the article examines Soviet writing on the Turkish working-class movement, which has been closely studied in the USSR.

Russians at the Building of the Suez Canal is an account of a paper read to the Soviet Geographical Society on the impressions of Russians who visited the Suez Canal during its construction. The author of this paper considers that Russian eye-witnesses' sympathy with the hardships of the Canal workers reflects their conviction that the people of Egypt were the true creators of the Canal, and as such its rightful owners.

Topics in Soviet Angle on the News are Soviet aid to Iraq and to the Yemen; the nationalization of UAR banks; Ben Gurion's visit to the USA; alleged Persian propaganda against the USSR; and military aspects of the Persian Budget.

SOVIET VIEWS ON TURKEY (2): THE STATE AND THE WORKERS

Soviet writers on Turkey often draw comparisons between the policy of the Turkish Government today and that of the Kemalist regime. This is the case as regards foreign policy, and in particular Turkey's relations with Russia (MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.2, pp.2-8); and it is also the case as regards the internal situation, and in particular the management of the country's economic affairs.

Etatism Turkey's experiment in State capitalism has received close attention in the Soviet Union. Explaining the genesis of etatism, Yu.Rozaliyev, the leading Soviet writer on the subject, says that it was devised by Turkey's national bourgeoisie as a means of protecting their economic interests (SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.9 of 1959). The national capital in their own hands was too weak to resist the foreign monopolies, and was in any case largely concentrated in trade and business; unable or unwilling to invest in industrial construction, which was essential if Turkey was to secure its independence from foreign economic control, they decided that the economic development programme must be financed by State capital, thus making the State "the biggest capitalist in the country". As a financial expedient, Rozaliyev regards etatism as a success: between 1932 and 1949, he says, the basic capital of privately owned industry increased three times and working capital nine times, whereas the basic capital of the State enterprises of the Sumer Bank increased 22 times, and their working capital 30 times.

In a backward country, says Rozaliyev, State capitalism is the most effective means of mobilizing national capital; and it can bear the brunt of the material losses suffered in the struggle between the national bourgeoisie as a whole and foreign monopolist capital. "In so far as State capitalism in the 1930s defended Turkey's national economic and political independence and promoted the development of its productive forces, to that extent it represented a positive factor. That it why the progressive forces of the country welcomed and supported State capitalist tendencies in the national economy."

This favourable Soviet view of etatism, however, is a recent development. In MODERN HISTORY OF THE COUNTRIES OF THE NON-SOVIET EAST (1954) E.F. Ludshuveyt said that by etatism the Turkish bourgeoisie had striven to strengthen its position "using State resources obtained by robbery from the people"; etatism meant "shifting the entire burden of the restoration and development of the economy on to the ordinary taxpayer". Ludshuveyt did indeed concede that etatism had "positive results" in promoting the development of consumer goods industries,"but it did nothing for the development of heavy industry, without which it was impossible to assure the economic independence of the country".

In a book published in 1956 (OUTLINES OF THE SITUATION OF THE TURKISH INDUSTRIAL PROLETARIAT AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR) Rozaliyev himself appears to have taken a less favourable view of etatism than he does today. Reviewing the book in SOVETSKOYE VOSTOKOVEDENIYE No.1 of 1958, B.M. Potskhveriya says that Rozaliyev did not properly appreciate the role of etatism in strengthening Turkey's economic independence: "the author underestimates the role of the national bourgeoisie and its interest in weakening the positions of foreign capital during this period." Rozaliyev's book, of course, was written before the XXth CPSU Congress of February 1956, at which the new and favourable attitude to bourgeois nationalism was formally proclaimed. It is this new attitude which no doubt accounts for the attention which Soviet orientalists today devote to problems of State capitalism in eastern countries, and not only in Turkey; and statements made since the XXIst CPSU Congress (MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.5 of 1959, pp.10-12) have confirmed that State capitalism remains a principal subject of study for Soviet scholars.

But, if the economic consequences of etatism earn Soviet approval, the ideological claims made by its exponents are roundly denounced. Turkish economists, says Rozaliyev, "strive to paralyse the struggle of the working class and peasantry" by claiming that since the Turkish revolution a classless State has arisen in which there are neither rich nor poor, neither exploiters nor exploited, while the welfare of the whole nation is in the State's keeping, and the State enterprises are like limited companies in which every Turk who pays taxes is a shareholder. Rozaliyev comments:

> "In fact State capitalism never had anything in common with socialism. The introduction of etatism was dictated above all by the interests of the bourgeoisie... The State in Turkey does not stand above classes and does not function in the interests of any ideal society. As in any capitalist State, the bourgeoisie in Turkey is only the executant of the will of the ruling class, the bourgeoisie."

The retreat from etatism The best period of etatism, according to Soviet writers, was in the years preceding the second World War. The Soviet Union, according to B.M. Dantsig (MODERN TURKEY, 1958), assisted Turkey's State projects; Soviet credits accounted for nearly 30 per cent of allocations for industrial construction under the first Turkish five-year plan (1934-8).

But, according to Rozaliyev, State capitalism fostered the growth of large private capital accumulations which demanded new outlets and necessitated a modification of the system of State capitalism itself. Rozaliyev traces the decline of etatism in an article in PROBLEMY VOSTOKOVEDENIYA No.1 of 1960. He recalls how from 1946 onwards the new Democratic Party attacked the Republican People's Party on the subject

of etatism, demanding that the State should only intervene in the affairs of enterprises whose capital or whose profits did not reach satisfactory figures, and insisting on the necessity of developing the private sector in Turkey's economy. These principles, says Rozaliyev, were put into effect when the Democratic Party came to power in 1950; and, he says, the new Government was only too willing to accede to the industrialists' request to allow foreign (and particularly American) capital into the country and to remove previous restrictions on it. Most of Rozaliyev's article is an account of the activities of the Business Bank (Turkiye Iş Bankasi); he emphasizes its connections with leading figures of the Democratic Party, and traces its rise to become "the biggest monopolist organization" in Turkey.

In his earlier article on State capitalism in Turkey (SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.9 of 1959) Rozaliyev remarked that, with the growth of the private sector, investment in the State sector was also increasing; State capitalism had been pressed into the service of the big bourgeoisie, but this did not mean that it had finally lost its positive significance:

> "So long as contradictions exist between the foreign imperialist monopolies and the local big bourgeoisie, State capitalism can be made use of as a force which counteracts imperialism."

In his latest article, however, Rozaliyev does not suggest that there are any "contradictions" between foreign and local big capital in Turkey; both, he says, work together against the interests of the working people:

> "The strengthening of the position of monopolist capital in the country leads to unprecedented growth of the exploitation of the workers and peasants of Turkey, and to the growth of their absolute and relative impoverishment. The striving of this capital towards the establishment of a political dictatorship is accompanied by a strengthening of reaction and a sharpening of class contradictions inside the country, as well as tendencies to external adventures."

The situation of the working class The volume of Soviet writing on the subject of the Turkish proletariat is considerable. An impressive amount of research has been carried out to ascertain the numbers employed in different industries, the numbers of unemployed, wages and real earnings, hours of work, industrial conditions, strikes, etc. A bibliographical article by A.D. Novichev in SOVETSKOYE VOSTOKOVEDENIYE No.5 of 1958 lists and describes 89 sources, Turkish and others, for the history of the Turkish working class; but a Soviet history of the Turkish working class has not in fact been written. Most Soviet writers say nothing about the existence of a Turkish working class movement prior to 1918. A recent

history (MODERN HISTORY OF THE COUNTRIES OF NON-SOVIET ASIA AND AFRICA, 1959) only says that the Turkish proletariat which was forming at the end of the 19th century was "multi-national", and that among skilled workers in particular the non-Turkish nationalities were in the majority. Novichev, however, says that the formation of the Turkish industrial proletariat began in the 1830s and 1840s, that by the 1870s Turkish factory workers were fighting for better conditions, and that this struggle was sharply intensified after the Young Turk Revolution. Similarly R.P. Korniyenko, reviewing the Turkish writer Lutfu Erisci's HISTORY OF THE TURKISH WORKING CLASS (SOVETSKOYE VOSTOKOVEDENIYE No.3 of 1957) notes that strikes took place in Istanbul in 1872, and remarks: "The Turkish working class came forward early into the field of class struggle." Korniyenko affirms that the Turkish working class took a very active part in Turkey's independence struggle after the first World War. Most Soviet writers insist that the principal moving force of the revolution was the peasantry, and that it was led, not by the proletariat - who were too small in numbers, and were mainly in the centres under Allied occupation - but by the national bourgeoisie.

Hostility between the Turkish working class and the Kemalist regime is in fact a theme in recent Soviet writing on this subject. In PROBLEMY VOSTOKOVEDENIYA No.2 of 1959 Korniyenko gives an account of working class struggle in 1922-3, immediately following the ending of hostilities in Anatolia. His main sources are the news summaries made by the press bureau of the Soviet diplomatic mission in Turkey, and the French Communist organ L'HUMANITE. Korniyenko's article is mainly an account of workers' demands for better pay and conditions; the formation of unions, and of the Socialist Worker-Peasant Party and the Communist Party, and their suppression; the formation of State-controlled "workers' unions"; and the large-scale strikes during the year 1923. The Kemalists, says Korniyenko, were unable "to bring the workers' movement under their control, to limit it or to draw it into the channel which the Government wanted"; and by their resolute struggle the workers won some concessions, which gave them confidence.

Rozaliyev (MODERN TURKEY, 1958) says that the workers intensified their demands during the crisis years of 1929-33, and that the Labour Law of 1936 represented a substantial victory for the workers. Of the situation since the second World War Soviet accounts are somewhat inconsistent, particularly as regards the trade unions. Rozaliyev says that the leaders of the trade union are Government-appointed, that their regulations have to be approved by the Ministry of Labour and that they are in fact under the control of the Ministry, that a Government inspector must be present at all their meetings, and that if any union leader incites members to a strike - which is an offence under the law - the union can be suppressed for a year or more. On the other hand, Rozaliyev quotes figures of the growth of the trade unions as evidence of the growing strength of the working class, and he says that "under the pressure of their rank-and-file members the Turkish trade unions often oblige the capitalists to

reckon with their demands". This conforms with recent Soviet contentions that the "reformist" and "free" trade unions can be fruitful ground for militant activity, at least among the rank and file (MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.8 of 1959, p.6). In a recent article (MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODYYE OTNOSHENIYA No.2 of 1960) Rozaliyev and Yu. Marunov quoted Turkish press reports that annual meetings of various trade unions had demanded the right to strike and the amendment of labour legislation. At the same time, reports of strikes are cited as proof that even in existing conditions the workers can fight for their rights.

With so much to say about the allegedly miserable condition of Turkish workers today, it might be expected that Soviet writers would go on to urge that the workers' prime object should be to secure the replacement of the present Government. In fact, however, they do not do this; no slogans are voiced about the formation of a national front Government or the introduction of a "democratic" regime (although not a little is said about democracy as regards the situation of the Turkish press). Instead, the plight of the workers and indeed all the ills of the country are blamed on the policy of "militarization"; the remedy, it is urged, is to be found in radical alteration of the country's foreign policy, non-participation in "aggressive blocs", and peaceful cooperation with all countries. Whatever eventual goal they may see for the Turkish working class movement, Soviet writers must concentrate on this first objective.

RUSSIANS AT THE BUILDING OF THE SUEZ CANAL

On 23rd November 1956, a few months after the nationalization of the Suez Canal, A.M. Lyubarskaya read a paper to the Eastern Commission of the Soviet Geographical Society entitled "Russian Travellers and Sailors at the Building of the Suez Canal". This has now been published by the Society in a collection of other articles on eastern subjects (COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES OF THE EAST, SERIES I). Lyubarskaya cites contemporary Russian accounts of the building of the Suez Canal as evidence that the Russian public has always felt that the Canal belongs by right to the people of Egypt who themselves built it. "The friendship of the Soviet and Egyptian peoples", says Lyubarskaya, "has long and deep roots. In the dark days of 1956 the Egyptians have had on their side the evidence of our forbears, who saw whose hands built the Suez Canal and what huge sacrifices its construction cost the Arab peoples."

On 29th March 1862, says Lyubarskaya, the newspaper ODESSKIY VESTNIK published an eye-witness account of work on the Canal written by a warrant officer serving in the Russian corvette Yastreb, Alexander Kovalevskiy.

Kovalevskiy said he had recently read an account of the digging of the Canal written by "a fervent Anglomane", full of hostility to this attempt to join the two seas; and this had impelled him to give the lie to such dishonest writing, and to insist on the advantages which the Canal would confer on maritime nations, especially Russia. Kovalevskiy also, according to Lyubarskaya, "rejected the contentions of foreign newspapers that the European colonizers were the creators of this great project, insisting that not they but the Egyptian fellahin were the true builders of the Canal". However, Lyubarskaya's only quotation from Kovalevskiy on this subject is the following: "The emigrants from France and Belgium, intending to enrich themselves from the digging of the Canal, possess no particular skill in any field, and for this reason mostly fasten themselves on to such posts as chef de section, caissier and various police duties."

Six months after the appearance of this dispatch, MORSKOY SBORNIK published a large portion of Kovalevskiy's notes on the construction of the Canal. Indignation with the foreign oppressors and sympathy with the enslaved and long-suffering Egyptian people pervade both of Kovalevskiy's contributions, says Lyubarskaya. Kovalevskiy describes how he passed through the plain of Tel el-Kebir and by Lake Timsah to the diggings in the desert. "Ten thousand labourers, sternly watched over by police with canes, will dig the Canal through to the lake... The work is being done simply, without special tools; the Arabs carry earth in local baskets... It is impossible not to sympathize with the half-savage but talented Arab when one sees how his enlighteners beat with canes this army of 10,000 labourers... who receive no reward and see no end to their labours... In the age of progress and humanity the French have placed each section under a shaykh and an official with canes."

Journeying in Egypt, says Lyubarskaya, Kovalevskiy had the opportunity of seeing that not only French overseers but also their compatriots then flooding into Egypt considered it permissible to thrash the local population. Once he was witness of how an Arab pilot on a dark night took a steamer up the Nile with surprising skill. But when the pilot refused to carry out the whim of a French mechanic the latter "shouted a number of complimentary remarks about Arabs and, despite the sensible replies of the pilot, brought a cane out of his cabin and threatened to treat the pilot to this refreshment brought from Europe."

Turning north, Kovalevskiy noted the beautiful buildings which the French, Belgians and other foreigners had erected for themselves between Al-Ballah and Lake Manzala, while "the Arabs after exhausting labour are put into primitive huts which, bearable in the dry air of the foothills, can become fatal amid the humid lakes". Kovalevskiy also described how, digging the Canal, the Arabs would scoop up the silt with their bare hands because the Company had no steam dredgers; instead of acquiring the necessary machinery, he said, de Lesseps preferred to demand from the rulers of Egypt another 40,000 fellahin as labourers.

Lyubarskaya then turns to other later Russian accounts of the Suez Canal and its construction, and remarks on the close attention with which this was followed in the Russian periodical press in the 1850s and 1860s. The Russian Geographical Society, she says, also played an important role in acquainting the public with the true facts about the Canal. "Reading the articles and correspondence of Russians who during those years visited the site of the future Canal, you again become convinced of the deep sympathy which they felt towards the Egyptian fellahin, the builders of the Canal." Lyubarskaya quotes one Russian eye-witness who praises the results achieved by Arab workers with primitive tools, and another who describes how workers, standing in slime, dug out the mud and loaded it on to the backs of other workers; "is it suprising", she asks, "that when cholera broke out in the isthmus the workers fell like flies?"

After an account of the participation of Russian vessels and visitors in the ceremonies marking the opening of the Canal, Lyubarskaya quotes from the latter's impressions, and particularly their criticisms of Britain's virtual control of the Canal. For example, V.A. Sollogub, in THE NEW EGYPT (St.Petersburg, 1871) said that Britain, unable to frustrate the undertaking as she would have wished, had instead gained financial control over it and had "enslaved" the country through which it passed. But Sollogub uttered a warning for the future: "In the Suez Canal we welcome the first awakening of the East... The time will come when hundreds of millions of slaves will know freedom; the time will come when hundreds of millions of victims to foreign profit-seeking... will receive their inalienable rights."

Lyubarskaya's paper is a typical example of the single-mindedness of Soviet historical research. Her object is to prove that the Russian people always regarded the Egyptian people as the true creators (and therefore the rightful owners) of the Suez Canal; and she accordingly cites passage after passage of Russian accounts of the sufferings of the Canal workers. One feels that none of the Russian writers she quotes quite says what she would like him to have said (although the passage from Sollogub's book suits her general theme very well); but this does not alter the import which she attributes to their statements, in her attempt to place Soviet-Egyptian friendship on a basis of pre-revolutionary Russian tradition.

SOVIET ANGLE ON THE NEWS

Below are reviewed reports on Middle East events appearing in Soviet newspapers and periodicals during the period 7th March - 5th April.

The Iraqi peace defenders' congress Soviet newspapers published short extracts of the speech made by Qasim at the opening of the third Iraqi peace defenders' congress on 31st March. A Soviet delegation of peace defenders was present at the congress, and a message of greetings from Khrushchev was read.

Anniversary of Soviet-Iraqi agreement On 18th March Soviet newspapers published an interview with Muhammad Hadid, the Iraqi Minister of Industry, on the first anniversary of the Soviet-Iraqi economic and technical cooperation agreement (MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.4 of 1959, p.9). The Minister spoke of the "vast energy" shown by the competent Soviet organizations in the preparatory work for the projects provided for in the agreement; and he expressed the Iraqi people's deep gratitude for this aid, which would promote the further progress of Iraq's economy, increase overall production, raise the national income and lead to a substantial rise in the living standard of the population.

Nationalization of UAR banks In a dispatch under the heading "Into State ownership", signed by V. Vladimirov, IZVESTIYA of 2nd April published an account of the nationalization of the Misr Bank and the National Bank of Egypt, of which the following are extracts:

> "This important measure has the object of mobilizing the finances of the country for strengthening the national economy and carrying out projects directed to the advancement of industry and agriculture. By the same token the State sector is expanded to a considerable degree in the financial field and Government control over the activity of private capital inside the country is strengthened... The nationalization of these banks has been welcomed by broad circles of the UAR public as a new step on the road of defending national interests and creating favourable conditions for further progress in the economic field."

Soviet aid to the Yemen IZVESTIYA of 31st March quoted the Yemeni newspaper AN-NASR for an article comparing the aid which the Yemen received from the socialist and from the capitalist countries. A long time ago, said the paper, the Yemen had applied for aid to the Western countries, and in particular to the USA; but, although agreements on US aid had already been signed, the USA was still demanding various guarantees from the Yemen and instead of aid had only sent delegations. In contrast to this, the Yemen had received genuine aid from the Soviet Union and China,

with both which countries the Yemen had signed agreements on technical and economic cooperation; the two countries were helping the Yemen in the construction of the port of Hudaydah and of a motor road from Hudaydah to San'a. Soviet and Chinese specialists were working with heart and soul for the sake of the Yemeni people.

Lebanon and the US Sixth Fleet KRASNAYA ZVEZDA of 23rd March reported Lebanese protests against a forthcoming visit of units of the US Sixth Fleet to Beirut. The newspaper said that spokesmen on behalf of the various quarters of Beirut had called on the Lebanese Premier and had denounced the visit and demanded its cancellation as being "an infringement of our national sovereignty, a threat to our independence and a violation of our national policy of neutrality".

Ben Gurion's visit to the USA In an article in PRAVDA on 18th March V. Borovskiy said that Ben Gurion's activities in America could only serve to increase international tension. The Israeli newspaper HABOKER had said that he would seek to advance his Government's "military-political plan" - the plan under which provocative attacks had already been launched across the UAR frontier. The Ambassadors of the 10 Arab States had rightly protested to the US Secretary of State about Ben Gurion's visit.

The Cyprus base In an article in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on 10th March M. Ivanov noted that the independence of Cyprus had been postponed because of failure to agree on the size of the British base. But in any case, said Ivanov, the base itself was a threat to peace, and was not in the interests of the Cypriot people: "the Western partisans of the arms race may fasten upon Cyprus their desired solution of the question of the bases, but they cannot stop the Cypriots' struggle for full independence."

Soviet-Persian relations KRASNAYA ZVEZDA of 30th March published an article by Lieut. Col. E. Ivanov denouncing Persian allegations about Soviet conduct in Persia during the last war. In June last year, said Lieut. Col. Ivanov, the Persian Government had called on the press to intensify anti-Soviet propaganda; and shortly afterwards a "national defence society" had been set up, which had published translations of books on "Communist atrocities", had planned showings of films on the situation behind the Iron Curtain, and had held anti-Soviet rallies.

In this campaign, said Lieut. Col. Ivanov, malicious distortions of Soviet-Persian relations during the second World War played a large part. Persian propagandists tried to depict the entry of Soviet forces into Persia in 1941 as an "aggression", and spread all kinds of fabrications about the conduct of Soviet forces in the country; one newspaper, for instance, had even said that Soviet soldiers had "buried thousands of

Persian patriots alive". The true facts were that by 1941 Persia was under direct German military control; that in August 1941 the Soviet Union in full accordance with the Soviet-Persian Treaty of 1921 had sent its forces into Persia; that during the war the USSR had provided food supplies and medical aid; that the Soviet troops had behaved in an exemplary manner - the writer quoted a tribute to their conduct by the present Minister of Defence Vosuq, then Colonel in charge of the Mashhad garrison; and that when the Soviet Union had withdrawn its forces in May 1946, in accordance with its undertakings, the friendly demonstrations by the local population had shown the warmth of their feelings towards the Soviet troops.

The Persian Budget The proportion of military expenditure in the Persian Budget was the subject of an article in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on 27th March. Allocations for military and police purposes, said the paper, amounted to 14,000 m. riyals, whereas expenditure on agriculture was only 776 m. riyals and on industry and mining only 143 m. riyals. Military expenditure, however, was not confined to the Budget; of 70,000 m.riyals expenditure under the Development Plan, 22,800 m. were for strategic purposes. All this was having a disastrous effect on prices and on living standards. The Persian Government seemed oblivious of the fact that a campaign for disarmament was in progress in the rest of the world.

The political situation in Turkey Soviet newspapers on 9th March reported that Turkish police armed with truncheons and tear-gas bombs had broken up a meeting held in Istanbul by a women's organization of the Republican People's Party. On 27th March TRUD reported that in Yesilhisar district police had opened fire on peaceful demonstrators protesting against the imprisonment without trial of Mehmet Bozkurt of the Republican People's Party.

Issued by Central Asian Research Centre
in association with
St. Antony's College (Oxford) Soviet Affairs Study Group